



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,349	01/23/2004	Seong Do Gim	LT-0044	4859
<div>34610 7590 07/31/2007 KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200</div>				
<div>EXAMINER DEBELIE, MITIKU W</div>				
<div>ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2621</div>				
<div>MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE 07/31/2007 PAPER</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,349

Applicant(s)

GIM, SEONG DO

Examiner

Mitiku Debelie

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 – 14, 16, 17, 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Duffield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,461,427).

The independent claim 7 will be analyzed first.

3. As to claim 7, Duffield discloses an apparatus (television) for setting a video signal processing mode for reproduction of video signal in a disk apparatus equipped with a tuner (Fig. 1, 122, 124), comprising (see col. 2, line 33 and lines 37 - 46):

means for detecting the type of broadcast signal received thru the tuner (controller 160) (see Fig. 1);

means for comparing the detected broadcast signal type with video mode set data stored in the disk apparatus to determine whether the detected broadcast signal type corresponds to the video mode set data (controller 160) (see Fig. 3, steps 320, 330 and 350); and

means for setting the signal processing mode of the disk apparatus to a video signal processing mode (controller 160) based on the result of the comparison (see Fig. 3, steps 340, 360, col. 2, lines 33 – 65).

As to claim 1, claim 1 is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 7. Therefore, claim 1 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above.

As to claim 2, Duffield teaches a method for setting signal processing mode for reproduction of signal in a disk apparatus wherein the broadcast signal is a video broadcast signal (see col. 4, lines 5 – 6).

As to claim 3, Duffield teaches a method for setting signal-processing mode for reproduction of signal in a disk apparatus wherein the signal processing mode is one of an NTSC mode (see col. 2, 8).

As to claim 4, Duffield teaches a method for setting signal processing mode for reproduction of signal in a disk apparatus wherein setting the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus (television) to a signal processing mode based on the result of the comparison comprises setting the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus (television) to a mode corresponding to the mode set data when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type corresponds to the mode set data (see Fig. 3, col. 5 lines 53 – 67, col. 6 lines 1 - 8).

As to claim 5, Duffield teaches a method for setting signal processing mode for reproduction of signal in a disk apparatus wherein setting the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a signal processing mode based on the result of the comparison

comprises: updating the stored mode set data with data corresponding to the detected broadcast signal type; and setting the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a mode corresponding to the detected broadcast signal type when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type does not correspond to the mode set data (see Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 13 - 52).

As to claim 6, Duffield teaches a method for setting signal processing mode for reproduction of signal in a disk apparatus wherein setting the signal processing

mode of the disc apparatus to a signal processing mode based on the result of the comparison comprises setting the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a mode corresponding to the stored mode set data when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type does not correspond to the mode set data, when the mode set data has been updated by a user (see Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 13 - 52).

Hamada's teachings for rejecting claim 15 apply for claim 18 in its entirety.

As to claim 8, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 2 apply for claim 8 in its entirety.

As to claim 9, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 3 apply for claim 9 in its entirety.

As to claim 10, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 4 apply for claim 10 in its entirety.

As to claim 11, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 5 apply for claim 11 in its entirety.

As to claim 12, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 6 apply for claim 12 in its entirety.

As to claim 13, claim 13 cites, **"A disc apparatus, comprising:
a receiver unit configured to receive a broadcast signal;
a processing unit configured to process the signal received by the receiver unit;
a reproduction unit configured to reproduce the signal, wherein the processing unit is further configured to detect a type of the broadcast signal received through the tuner, compare the detected broadcast signal type with stored mode set data to determine whether the detected broadcast signal type corresponds to the mode set data, and set the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a signal processing mode based on the result of the comparison."** This claim reads on claim 7 which is analyzed above.

As to claim 14, Duffield teaches a disk apparatus (television) comprising a memory (162) (see Fig. 4, col. 3, lines 51 – 53).

As to claim 16, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 2 apply for claim 16 in its entirety.

As to claim 17, Duffield's teachings for rejecting claim 3 apply for claim 17 in its entirety.

As to claim 19, claim 19 cites, **"The disc apparatus according to claim 13, wherein the processing unit is further configured to set the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a mode corresponding to the mode set data when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type corresponds to the mode set data."** This claim reads on claim 6 which is analyzed above.

As to claim 20, claim 20 cites, **"The disc apparatus according to claim 13, wherein the processing unit is further configured to update the stored mode set data with data corresponding to the detected broadcast signal type, and set the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a mode corresponding to the detected broadcast signal type when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type does not correspond to the mode set data."** This claim reads on claim 6 which is analyzed above.

As to claim 21, claim 21 cites, **"The disc apparatus according to claim 13, wherein the processing unit is further configured to set the signal processing mode of the disc apparatus to a mode corresponding to the stored mode set data when it is determined, based on the result of the comparison, that the detected broadcast signal type does not correspond to the mode set data, when the mode set data has been updated by a user."** This claim reads on claim 6 which is analyzed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duffield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,461,427) as applied to claims 1 – 14, 16, 17, 19 – 22 above, and in view of official notice.

6. As to claim 15, Duffield teaches all the claimed limitations as stated above except an optical disk apparatus.

The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use optical disk in order to be able to store and retrieve data using a computer.

As to claim 18, Duffield teaches all the claimed limitations as stated above except the DVD player unit.

The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use DVD player in order to display digital video data.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kim (U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,099), Penney (U.S. Pat. No. 5,325,131), Citta (U.S. Pat. No. 5,283,653) and Ducart (U.S. Pat. No. 4,870,489) are cited to teach detecting and converting broadcast signals from one format to another.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitiku Debelie whose telephone number is (571) 270 1706. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 5:00 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on (571) 272 7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MD
07/20/2007

Mehrdad Dastouri
MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600
for Thai Tran